

|   |                        |                               |  |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>           |  |
|   | 09/213,834             | ROMANTCHIKOV, YURI<br>(IOURI) |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>               |  |
|   | Marjorie A. Moran      | 1631                          |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Joseph Coppola.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 May 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*47 and 49*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the attorney that claim numbers at the ends of claims 47 and 49 appear to be missing. The numbers "46" and "48" appeared to be cut off at the ends of claims 47 and 49 respectively, apparently due to either a copy error or a scanning error. Mr. Coppola confirmed that claims 47 and 49 are intended to be "original claims"; i.e. not amended. Claim 47 is intended to depend from claim 46 and claim 49 is intended to depend from claim 48, as originally recited. As the claims are NOT AMENDED, but are the same as the original, the examiner stated that she would not attempt to "fix" the claims by examiner's amendment, but would merely make the situation of record in order to avoid possible confusion upon printing.